



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

cated natural selection as the sole cause of organic evolution and pronounced the inheritance of acquired characters to be impossible. Mr. Wallace called his book 'Darwinism.' In time these opinions were called the 'New Darwinism,' although some of them were quite at variance with those always held by Darwin up to his death.

A little later Dr. Romanes' book called 'After Darwinism' appeared, in which he amplified the views held by Darwin in a way to which, I think, Darwin himself would have agreed. This also has been called by some the 'New-Darwinism' with, as I think, a much better right to the title than those advocated in Wallace's book, which should have been called Wallaceism. I object to Mr. H. Spencer and others using the term New-Darwinism for Wallace's opinions; for, when it is shown that these are wrong, the unscientific public will naturally conclude that Darwin was also wrong, although he would himself have repudiated this New-Darwinism.

F. W. HUTTON.

CANTERBURY MUSEUM,
CHRIST CHURCH, NEW ZEALAND,
February, 21, 1900.

'THE ESKIMO OF SMITH SOUND.'

To THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The attention of the readers of SCIENCE is specially invited to a pamphlet of sixty pages, published by the American Museum of Natural History, entitled 'The Eskimo of Smith Sound,' by A. L. Kroeber. The Smith Sound Eskimo stand ethnologically between those of Greenland and the Central Eskimo and form a transition from the latter to the former. The theory of Holm that the Angmagsalingmiut (East Greenlanders) reached their present abode by following the ice-bound shores of Northern Greenland, is held to be untenable. Again, in examining Kroeber's illustrations, the opinion long ago published by this writer that no unsophisticated Eskimo ever etched on bone, ivory or antler is sustained. The small amount of engraving present is evidently the work of steel tools.

But, most interesting of all the accounts in the pamphlet is that concerning the loss and recovery of the kaiak. These Smith Sound

Eskimo were discovered by Sir John Ross, in 1818, and were afterwards visited by Franklin, Kane, Hayes, Hall and others. Now, none of the explorers saw kaiaks in the sound. The art of building them had apparently been forgotten, though the word 'kaiak' remained in the language. From the time of Ross abundance of material for the structure was at hand, the environment was there begging for kaiaks, but the culture-hero had to come and teach them their own lost art. Between 1868 and Peary's visit the Adlet (Ellesmere Land Eskimo) had furnished the culture-hero and now the fisherman recovers his skill. The arts of the Smith Sound Eskimo are clearly set forth and compared with the Central tribes of Boas, and the traditions given at length.

O. T. MASON.

A CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE:—Every scientific writer who has read with open mind the entreaties of recent writers on the subject has already adopted the plan of giving the year (as well as the volume) of any journal to which he has occasion to refer; few people wish to look up the reference (only those who are about to write on the subject), but every one who reads the article at all is interested in knowing the date of the contribution to the subject referred to—often, in fact, the reference wholly loses its point from a lack of this knowledge. Since, moreover, there are still many scientific writers who do not belong to the above described category, I wish to suggest that it would be a work of very great value if some one would issue a finding list, covering several hundreds of the principal scientific journals, which would enable the reader to pass at a glance from volume to year. Such a list would involve very little trouble on the part of whoever would be so good as to make it up, and it would certainly be a very great convenience. It might be printed on separate cards for separate subjects, and the scientific reader could have these cards (or as many of them as interested him) always at his elbow.

If both year and volume cannot be given when articles are referred to (for economy of space—there can be no other reason), it seems